REMARKS

Claims 1-39 were pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 8, 17-20, 24, 27-30, 32-35 and 37 have been amended. Claim 40 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-40 are pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-9, 11-25, and 27-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Archibald, Jr. et al. (U.S. Publication # 20020169995A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Archibald teaches "performing data consistency checks on user data stored in a data storage subsystem." (Archibald, Page 1, Paragraph 0001) Specifically, Archibald teaches "If an inconsistency is detected between a calculated DCCds and a stored DCCds for a data sector…the user sector body of data for the affected sector is regenerated using the remaining good data and parity sector." (Archibald, Page 4, Paragraph 0036)

Applicant respectfully submits that Archibald fails to teach or suggest "said storage controller is further configured to <u>initialize</u> a given stripe in response to detecting a mismatch in said block verification information associated with at least one data block of said given stripe; wherein <u>said storage controller is configured to initialize said given stripe by generating a corresponding redundancy data block for said given stripe based on at least an updated data block to be written to said given stripe</u>" as recited in claim 1. In accordance, independent claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald.

Claims 3-9 and 11-16 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for at least the reasons given above.

In addition, independent claim 27 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 1 and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1. Claims 29-31 depend on claim 27 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for the same reasons.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that Archibald fails to teach or suggest "said storage controller is further configured to <u>initialize</u> a given stripe in response to detecting a mismatch in said block verification information in at least <u>two data blocks</u> of said given stripe; wherein <u>said storage controller is configured to initialize said given stripe by generating a corresponding redundancy data block for said given stripe based on at least an updated data block to be written to said given stripe</u>" as recited in claim 17. In accordance, independent claim 17 is believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald.

Claims 19-25 depend on claim 17 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for at least the reasons given above.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Archibald fails to teach or suggest "<u>initializing</u> a given stripe in response to detecting a mismatch in said block verification information associated with at least one data block of said given stripe; wherein <u>said initializing said given stripe comprises generating a corresponding redundancy data block for said given stripe based on at least an updated data block to be written to said given stripe</u>" as recited in claim 32. In accordance, independent claim 32 is believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald.

Claims 34-38 depend on claim 32 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for at least the reasons given above.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests examination of added claim 40.

Applicant respectfully submits that Archibald fails to teach or suggest "<u>initializing a subset</u>

12

of said stripes in said data storage subsystem; performing a partial write <u>to at least one of said</u> <u>stripes of said subset</u>; and <u>subsequent to performing the partial write</u> to at least one of said stripes of said subset, <u>initializing one or more remaining stripes</u> in said data storage subsystem" as recited in claim 40. In accordance, independent claim 40 is believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 10, 26, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Archibald in view of IBM. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant believes claim 10, claim 26, and claim 39 are patentably distinguishable as dependent on claim 1, claim 17, and claim 32, respectively, which are believed to patentably distinguish over Archibald for at least the above stated reasons.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-77800/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,

B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: March 24, 2004